



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their reign over the human mind will be at an end in every country where education and civilised life are not extinguished by the iron hand of despotism or ecclesiastical tyranny.

In the meantime, let us steadily persevere in our endeavours to plead the cause of truth and charity in the only manner becoming such a sacred cause, and never lose sight of that Christian candour and forbearance which true religion alone can inspire. Let us strive to live down the calumnies of our foes, and never despair of converting to the truth even those who are at present the most bitterly opposed to us, and apparently hopeless. For ourselves we despair of none, and pray for all our fellow-countrymen, that it may please the Giver of all good gifts in His own good time to bring all men to a knowledge of the truth, and make all one fold under one shepherd, JESUS CHRIST, His Son, our Lord.

HOW TO BECOME A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

THOUGH we have already drawn so largely on the late charge of the Archbishop of Dublin in another page of our present number, we cannot refrain from giving our readers the following further extract upon another subject, which, in our judgment, throws a vivid light upon what is to many Protestant minds a dark and mysterious problem, very difficult of satisfactory solution, viz., how is it possible that those who have been educated in Protestant freedom should ever lapse into the spiritual slavery of the Church of Rome? We think his Grace has, with his usual acuteness, discovered the true clue to the apparent enigma. Such conversions are not the results of *intellectual* conviction, but mere acts of the *will*.

Can such an act end in giving rest to the intellect or peace to the mind?

"It is a remarkable fact that of the persons who have joined the Roman Catholic Church a large proportion are of a character the very opposite to that from which most would have anticipated such a result. They are persons not distinguished by excessive self-distrust, or a tendency to excessive and unreasonable deference and submissiveness, and a readiness on slight grounds to acquiesce in what is said; but in all respects the very opposite of all this; arrogant, self-confident, wilful, indocile, disdainful of any one who opposes their views, and inclined to demand stronger proof of anything they are called on to believe than the case admits of, or than a reasonable man would require. Yet, such persons are found yielding to one of the worst supported claims that ever was set up, and assenting to a long list of most paradoxical propositions, every one of which has a vast mass of evidence against it, and hardly anything that can be called an argument in its favour.

"The case seems to be that a reaction takes place in a mind of this description; and the individual rushes with a vehemence that is quite characteristic from one extreme to the opposite. He is weary of inquiring, discussing, investigating, answering objections, and forming a judgment on a multitude of separate points, and so resolves to cut short, at once, all this disquieting fatigue, by accepting, implicitly, the decisions on all points of an authority which demands submission, not on the ground of a conviction of the understanding, but as an act of the *will*, commanding us to stifle doubts, and shun inquiry, and set evidence at defiance.

"Such is almost the very language of one of the converts in question. 'Don't stand at the door arguing; but enter the great home of the soul; enter, and adore. . . . Faith ever begins with a venture, and is rewarded with sight. . . . Such a person is under no duty to wait for clearer light. He will not have, he cannot expect, clearer light *before conversion*. Certainty, in the highest sense, is the reward of those who, by an act of the *will*, embrace the truth, when nature, like a coward, shrinks. You must make a venture. Faith is a venture, before a man is a Catholic, and "grace after it." ("Loss and gain.") Such a man is like one, who, being the proprietor of some great manufacturing, or commercial, or agricultural concern, becomes weary of looking after a multitude of details in the various departments of the business, and watching the various persons employed in it, and thereupon resolves to throw the whole superintendence into the hands of an agent, provided with an ample power-of-attorney, and entrusted with unlimited control throughout.

"This may be a very wise course, supposing the agent fixed on be one whom there are good grounds for thus trusting, as thoroughly well qualified both in point of skill and of integrity. But nothing can be a more monstrous absurdity, supposing him fixed on at random, on no grounds but his own boastful and unsupported pretensions, and merely because the proprietor resolved that he would fully trust *some* one, and only *one*. He has, indeed, thus cleared himself of a multitude of cares and difficulties and responsibilities, but at the risk of a universal and total ruin. And the convert who proceeds in an analogous manner, has exchanged a number of questions on this, that, and the

other point, for one, which, however, comprehends in it all the rest together, and presents a great difficulty besides, of itself. For he who has adopted a multitude of errors in the lump, on the authority of a guide, whom he has no reason to trust, is responsible for all and each of those errors, and for that of choosing, by a mere act of will, such a guide, in addition.

"A man who adopts this course is likely to obtain little or nothing of that tranquillity of mind which he had hoped for, and for which he had paid so dear. In proportion as he is intelligent and thoughtful, he will be haunted with the suspicion, 'Is there not a lie in my right hand?' Was I justified in shutting the eyes God gave me, and giving myself up to be led by a blind guide? Is not the well-compacted fabric of faith built on a foundation of sand? And the more he resolves to turn away his thoughts from evidence, and to banish doubts, the more he will feel that there are doubts unresolved, and that evidence is against him. A firm determination of the *will* to believe he will find to be far different from a real firm belief. And he will probably end—where some, it is likely, have begun—in securing that alone which alone does lie within the reach of will, a vehement protestation of belief, and inculcation of it on others, with a full conviction, indeed, of the usefulness of his religion, as a means of influencing the vulgar, and satisfying their craving for some devotional exercise, but with little or no conviction of its truth.

"Such a state of mind is likely to be fostered—perhaps generated by some writers of no small popularity in the present day. One of them, deriding and censuring all appeals to evidence of the truth of Christianity, urges men to embrace it merely from 'feeling the want of it.' He himself at one time embraced Socinianism and at another, German Transcendentalism, from such feelings of *want*. And the 'want' of a deliverer from the Roman yoke led the Jews of old to reject the true Christ, and to follow false pretenders.

"Again, a reviewer of the life of Gibbon (in *Fraser's Magazine*) attributes the historian's infidelity to his study of the evidences of Christianity. And he would have people taught that the truth of the Gospel never was denied by any one!

"Another reviewer (of the Life of Baxter, in the *Edinburgh*) tells us, with marvellous ignorance, or trust in the reader's ignorance, that 'the Apostles denounced unbelief as sin—not, as is the fact, because they offered "many infallible proofs;" but without any proof at all. And he assures us that inquiry into the evidences of Christianity is likely to lead to disbelief of it.'

"That an avowed infidel should say this is nothing strange; but it is truly wonderful that writers apparently zealous in the cause of Christianity should not perceive that they are defeating their own object, and that a declaration from a *professed believer* that inquiry into the evidences of Christianity is likely to end in rejection of it does more to produce infidelity than the most ingenious objections of all the professed unbelievers in existence."

Correspondence.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I have, as you justly observed in your last number, a very great respect for the doctrines which St. Augustine held; and, as a farther proof that transubstantiation was one of those doctrines, I will bring forward other quotations from his writings, which I hope you and the readers of your journal will study carefully.

The saint, in explaining our Lord's words, viz.:—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing," John vi., 64, says—"What means, the flesh profiteth nothing? It profits nothing, as they understood it; for they understood flesh as it is torn in pieces in a dead body, or sold in the shambles, and not as it is animated by the spirit. Therefore, it is said the flesh profiteth nothing; in the same manner as it is said, 'Knowledge puffeth up.' I. Cor. viii., 1. Must we, then, fly from knowledge? God forbid? What, then, means, 'Knowledge puffeth up?' That is, if it be alone, without charity; therefore, the apostle added, 'but charity edifieth.' Join, therefore, charity to knowledge, and knowledge will be profitable, not by itself, but through charity; so, here also, the flesh profiteth nothing, viz., the flesh alone. Let the spirit be joined with the flesh, as charity is to be joined with knowledge, and then it profits much. For, if the flesh profiteth nothing, the Word (Christ) would not have been made flesh, that He might dwell in us."—Treatise (27th) on St. John. Will that satisfy you? Now, did St. Augustine believe in transubstantiation? Who will have the hardihood, after reading this extract, to assert that he did not? But, you urge, St. Augustine employs the word "sign" in other places, when speaking of the Eucharist. I know he does, but can you not see what he means by it? He simply means that the outward forms of bread and wine are a sign or figure. The following passage, however, from his writings, ought to set the matter for ever at rest, as far as that almost inspired saint is concerned, viz.:—"Thou hast," says he, "life everlasting in the ministration of thy body and blood. Thou art life everlasting itself, and thou givest not in thy flesh and blood

but that which thyself art." That is certainly very plain. Read it again.

You say that the Church of Rome, contrary to antiquity—contrary to the plain evidence of the senses—asserts that "Christ is substantially and corporeally present." I confess, indeed, that my senses discover nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine, and that I do not see nor taste the flesh and blood of Christ. But, Mr. Editor, Christ tells me—"Blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed." John xx., 29. I would then incline to say with St. Thomas Aquinas:—

"In touch, taste, sight, although deceived we be,
The word of God is quite enough for me;
What God declares is true, I must believe;
The word of truth itself cannot deceive."
And with Queen Elizabeth, before her apostacy:—

"Christ was the word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it;
And what that word did make it,
That I believe, and take it."

With all Christendom, for fifteen centuries, I would sooner believe the testimony of my divine Saviour, than the testimony of my senses; to speak more correctly, I am not obliged to disbelieve the testimony of my senses, for, you know, or ought to know, that what we perceive of anything, by our senses, is not the substance of the thing itself, but mere accident, such as form, colour, taste, &c., &c. Now, it is very evident that God, to whom nothing is impossible, may very easily change the substance of a thing, and yet continue the accidents, or cause it to make upon our senses the same impression which it did before. This is exactly what I believe of the Eucharist, and is it, I ask, unreasonable?

Now, let us see whether the Church of Rome is contrary to antiquity in asserting that Christ is substantially and corporeally present in the Eucharist. To prove that your assertion is false, and that there is a perfect concord between the Church of Rome and "antiquity" on the doctrine in question, I will give a few extracts from the writings of the most ancient and renowned of the Fathers. I shall only quote two or three to avoid being tedious, viz.:—"As Jesus Christ incarnate had flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." Justin Martyr, Apol. ii. These are very plain words. "As the Son liveth by the Father, even so do we by His flesh." St. Hilary, Li. 8. "The bread which our Lord gave to his disciples, being changed, not in shape, but in nature, by the omnipotence of the Word, is made flesh." St. Cyprian, Ser.

"Though by nature of our flesh we are corruptible, yet by participation of life we are reformed to the property of life. For not only our souls were to be lifted up by the Holy Ghost to life everlasting, but this rude, gross, terrestrial body of ours is to be reduced to immortality by touching, tasting, and eating this agreeable food of Christ's body. And when Christ saith—I will raise him up, he meaneth that this body which he calleth shall raise him up." St. Cyril.

"I do, therefore, now rightly believe that the bread sanctified by the word of God is changed into the body of God, the Word. Not so that by being eaten it becomes the body of the Word, but because it is suddenly changed into his body by this word, 'This is my body.' And this is effected by the virtue of benediction, by which the nature of those things which appear are transubstantiated into it." St. Gregory Nyssen, Orat. Catech.

"Before it be consecrated it is but bread, but when the words of consecration come, it is the body of Christ." St. Ambrose. Lib. 4 de Sac., chap. 5. Now, is the Church of Rome opposed to antiquity?

Your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Passage, July 1, 1856.

We feel it necessary, in order to prevent this discussion with Mr. Rourke from running on to an interminable length, to recall his attention to the exact point in dispute.

Our correspondent professes himself to be a believer in transubstantiation. This doctrine is defined in the catechism of the Council of Trent to mean, that the true physical body, bones, and sinews of Christ (verum Christi corpus, ossa, et nervos) are present in the Eucharist, under the outward form of bread and wine. (Cat. Conc. Trid., p. 189, Lips. 1851.) This is the point which is to be proved. Mr. Rourke first adduced the words of consecration in the Eucharist, "This is my body." We urged that these words do not prove that the bread is changed into the actual body of Christ; for we find that our Lord immediately added, with reference to the other part of the Eucharist, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood;" and no one can reasonably maintain, that the cup was changed into a Testament, or was physically identical with it. Our correspondent, in his next letter, fell back on the Fathers, and quoted, among others, a passage from St. Augustine, in which it is said, that "our Lord carried his body in his own hands." We proved, by a reference to another statement in the works of that eminent Father, that St. Augustine called the Eucharist the *sign* of the body of Christ; and we inferred, that it was only reasonable to suppose, that, in accordance with Scripture usage, he spoke of the sign under the character of the thing signified.

Mr. Rourke, in his present letter, returns again to St. Augustine. He cautiously abstains from bringing forward any passage which, in plain language, makes an assertion similar to that which we have quoted above, from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, namely, that the eucharistic elements are changed into the flesh, bones, and blood of Christ. If he did, the discussion would be at an end; but Mr. Rourke knows well that there is no such passage to be found in all the writings of St. Augustine. He attempts, however, still to make out that St. Augustine held the modern Romish doctrine; and, after quoting a long passage from him, he triumphantly asks, "Now, did St. Augustine believe in transubstantiation? Who will have the hardihood, after reading this extract, to assert that he did not?" Now, the only clause in this extract which even seems to approach the Romish doctrine is the last sentence, "For if the flesh profiteth nothing, the Word (Christ) would not have been made flesh, that he might dwell in us." We beg to ask Mr. Rourke, did he read the context of this passage? If he did not, we will supply it for our readers: "If Christ profited us much by the flesh," [i. e., by taking our fleshy nature upon him,] "how can the flesh profit nothing? It was by the flesh that the Spirit wrought for our salvation. The flesh was only a vessel. Consider what it contained, not what it was. *The apostles were sent; did their flesh profit us nothing?* If the flesh of the apostles profiteth us, shall the flesh of Christ profit us nothing? From whence does the sound of the Word come to us, unless by a voice of flesh, &c?" Is it not plainly evident from all this, that when St. Augustine speaks of the flesh of Christ, he is referring to the mystery of the incarnation, and that there is not the faintest allusion to the sacrament of the Lord's supper?

But, perhaps Mr. Rourke will insist on the closing words of the extract, "That he might dwell in us," and will assert, that they refer to the reception of the physical body of Christ by each communicant in the Eucharist. This is really the only interpretation we can put upon the passage which even seems to support Mr. Rourke's views. But, the words of St. Augustine, in the very same page, prove that he is speaking of a spiritual in-dwelling. "We have said, brethren," he writes, "that the Lord commandeth this to us in the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, that we should abide in Him, and He in us. *We abide in Him, when we are his members; and He abideth in us when we are his temple.*"^b Can any words more plainly imply that St. Augustine is throughout speaking not of the physical act of receiving the Eucharist, but of the spiritual in-dwelling of Christ and his people? Are we the literal members of Christ's natural body? Surely not. Of what nature, then, is his abiding in us? The apostle plainly tells us that it is a spiritual in-dwelling. "Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (2 Cor. vi., 16.)

We have dwelt the longer on this passage of St. Augustine because Mr. Rourke quoted it as if it were decisive of the opinion of that Father on the question of transubstantiation; whereas, when carefully examined, there is not a line in it which yields any support whatever to that dogma of the Romish Church. We entreat Mr. Rourke to study the context or the passages which he quotes, to read them impartially, and not solely with a view of supporting his own pre-conceived opinions, and then, we trust that he will arrive at sounder views respecting their true meaning. We are inclined to suspect that he takes these passages from some manual of controversy; for, otherwise, we cannot account for the total absence of all reference to the pages or the editions in which they are to be found. The very next passage cited by him, professedly from St. Augustine, has no reference of any kind! We have a great respect for Mr. Rourke, but we will not take his authorities on trust. We have neither time nor inclination to search through the eleven folio volumes of St. Augustine for the four lines which he cites, nor will we discuss the other passages which he quotes, unless he furnishes us with some more accurate indication of where they are to be found than he has given us in his present letter. A former correspondent of ours,^c in arguing for transubstantiation, quoted the following passage from Tertullian:—"The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, He changed into his body." Here our correspondent stopped; and, certainly, these words look more like transubstantiation than any of those quoted by Mr. Rourke. But when we referred to the original, what were the very next words which we found there? "He changed into his body—saying, This is my body—that is, a figure of my body"—(Corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum, dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. Adv. Marc. iv. 40, p. 458. Par. 1675). We do not quote this passage in order to convince Mr. Rourke. No doubt, he will try to explain these words away as he did those of St. Augustine. He will say, "he simply means that the outward forms of bread and wine are a sign or figure." But, we trust that all our readers are not so strongly biased as he appears to be; and we wish to prove to them the necessity of care and attention to the whole drift and context of any passage taken from an ancient author, in order to see what the author really means, and not to rely upon a few isolated words, without check or reference of any kind.

^a Vide St. August. Opera. Tom. III, col. 508. Ed. Ben.

^b Ib. Col. 504. ^c Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. 3, p. 51.

Mr. Bourke goes on to add—"With all Christendom for fifteen centuries, I would sooner believe the testimony of my divine Saviour than the testimony of my senses." We beg to remind him, in the first place, that transubstantiation was not made a dogma of the Romish Church until the year 1215, A.D., at the third Council of Lateran; and, in the second place, that if he chooses to put a particular meaning of his own upon our Saviour's words, he is not believing the testimony of our Saviour at all. St. John tells us that, when our Lord said to the Jews, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," the Jewish people thought that He spake of the temple in which they then stood; whereas, in truth, he spoke figuratively of the temple of his own body (St. John ii., 19-21). And so it is with the doctrine of the Eucharist. The whole question turns upon this—What do the words "This is my body" really mean? and how are they to be interpreted? The Protestant has as much, nay much more, reason to contend that he believes the testimony of his Saviour than Mr. Rourke, for he has the whole analogy of Scripture language in favour of the interpretation which he adopts. No man can be obliged to disbelieve the testimony of his senses. How does Mr. Rourke know that the words "This is my body" are really to be found in Scripture, but by his eyes and ears? and on what evidence does Scripture itself depend, but on miracles, which are a direct appeal to the senses, and presuppose the truth of the evidence which the senses afford? Before we reject the testimony of our senses, we ought to be very sure that God has plainly spoken, and that our meaning can be rationally given to His words.

Mr. Rourke says that God can change the substance of a body, and yet cause it to make the same impression on our senses. Before we assent to this proposition or deny it, we should like Mr. Rourke to explain to us, in plain English, what he means by the "substance" of a body. Suppose that the substance of every body in the universe were annihilated to-morrow, provided that they continued to make the same impression on our senses as before—that their size, weight, colour, shape, &c., remained the same, we should like to know whether any one would miss the loss of their substances?

A NEW TRINITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I have more than once sought, through the medium of your paper, for the solution of difficulties which had presented themselves to my mind before I ever contemplated leaving the communion of the Church of Rome. I did this for the benefit of others who might be seeking, as I long did, to find such reasons as could justify them to their own consciences in remaining professors of the faith in which they had been educated.

I utterly failed to find in Catholic books any arguments that could either satisfy or stifle my own doubts; and I cannot congratulate myself on having elicited for others even the meagre explanations that I would willingly and thankfully have accepted in my own case. You know that no answer has ever been returned (by those who alone could give an answer satisfactory to Catholics) to any of the inquiries I have made through your paper.

Will you now allow me occasionally to record the practical answers which the Church gives when she is not directly called on to explain or expose her teaching?

In the following translated extracts from a recently published French book of devotion,* you will find the latest addition to the Catholic articles of faith.

The creation, perhaps rather the existence, of a second Trinity, "truly worthy of the vows, the offerings, and the ADORATIONS of all the children of God," has not yet been formally decreed an article of faith, rejectable only under pain of mortal sin, but it seems to be progressing rapidly towards such a distinction.

I should feel thoroughly ashamed to translate such incomprehensible, such ungodly nonsense, if it were not necessary to the cure of a disease, that it should be studied in every symptom under which it presents itself to our observation.

I send you a copy of the work from which I have made the following extracts, and shall be only too happy to be convinced that I have either erred in my translation from the original, or that I have formed a hasty and unjustifiable conclusion from the text, if fairly translated.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

IN EARNEST.

"THE POWER OF ST. JOSEPH,
Or, Exercises of Piety and new Meditations in honour of St. Joseph on each of his festivals during the month of March, and on every Wednesday in the year, with a great number of prayers, precepts, and examples, approved by His Eminence, Monsgr. the Cardinal de Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons, par le P. A. Huguet, Mariste. Second edition, revised with care.

"Address yourselves to Saint Joseph." Genesis xli. 55. [Extracts from the Neuvaire, or nine days' devotion to St. Joseph.]

Page 142. "The three august personages who inhabit the

* We are much obliged to our correspondent for the volume in question. It is entitled, "Pouvoir de Saint Joseph, ou Exercices de piété, et nouvelles méditations pour honorer Saint Joseph à chacune de ses fêtes, pendant le mois de Mars, &c., avec un grand nombre de prières, &c. Approuvé par Son Em. Mgr. Le Cardinal de Bonald, Archevêque de Lyon, par le P. A. M. Huguet, Mariste. Pelisse Frères Rue St. Sulpice, 38. Paris. 2nd edition. 1856.

humble dwelling of Nazareth represent to us, admirably, the divine perfections and the indissoluble union of the three adorable persons of the heavenly and eternal Trinity.

"In the uncreated Trinity we contemplate a unity of essence in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and in this union an admirable identity of thoughts, affections, and desires. In the same manner, we see in the created Trinity a union of love and grace in three essences, and three persons, Jesus, Mary, and Joseph; and in this union, an entire conformity of desires and of wills.

"We remark in the former that God the Father engendered his only Son in eternity; and in the latter, that Jesus gives, during time, a spiritual being to Joseph his father, and to Mary his mother, by an admirable, although, it seems, inverted order. In the uncreated Trinity, the Father and the Son in unity of principle produce the Holy Spirit, and in the created Trinity, Jesus and Mary in unity of spirit cause Joseph to grow in grace and merit. In fine, it is difficult to speak and to write of the one person who belongs to both Trinities, without allowing the intervention of the other two at the same time, on account of the habitudes and close connection that exist between them; and this it is that, in speaking of Joseph, places us under a pleasing obligation to trace some features of Jesus and Mary, from whom we cannot separate him without despoiling him of some of the most beautiful flowers of his crown."

"We find in the Holy Scriptures admirable figures of the relations which ought to exist between these three august persons. If Jesus be the Tree of Life, Mary is the terrestrial Paradise, refreshed by the waters of grace, in the midst of which He is planted, and Joseph the cherubim, guardian both of the Paradise and of the tree. If Mary be the mystical dove, is not Jesus the olive branch, the symbol of peace, and the peace itself of the world, which she carried in her immaculate bosom, and is not Joseph the true Noah who brought the dove into his own dwelling, and received from her the author of reconciliation between God and man? If Joseph be the root of Jesse, is not Mary the stem, and Jesus the flower borne by the stem? If Jesus be the fountain springing in the terrestrial Paradise, is not Mary the basin that receives the waters, and is not Joseph he who spreads them abroad? If Mary be more beautiful than the moon, is not Joseph more brilliant than a star, and is not Jesus the Divine Sun of Justice, from which they receive their light? If Jesus be the ark of the New Testament, is not Mary the Holy of Holies in which the ark is hidden, and Joseph the veil which conceals from the eyes of the Jews the mysteries shut up in both? If Jesus be the propitiatory of the evangelical law, are not Mary and Joseph the two cherubims, one having the face of a woman, the other that of a man, which, spreading the wings of their affections and looking at each other, contemplate the Saviour, admiring and adoring Him unceasingly.

"These are beautiful figures of the union which existed between these three holy persons. Death, which divides all, could not break the knot of their love, which God himself had formed. If it could separate them as to time and space, it was only to re-unite them eternally in the dwellings of glory.

"We may, then, affirm, without fear of deceiving ourselves, that as in heaven there is an ineffable Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so there is on earth another Trinity, Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, of which the Gospels speak.

"The learned and pious Gerson, lost in admiration in the contemplation of this mystery, exclaims in a transport of love—"Oh, beautiful! oh, amiable! oh, honourable Trinity! Jesus, Mary, Joseph, whom the divinity has united by the tie of inviolable charity, you are truly deserving of the vows, the offerings, the ADORATIONS of all the children of God. There never was in the world anything so excellent, so august as you; our earth was not worthy of you, and heaven might justly envy her, and bear away from her a treasure so precious, a deposit so holy!"

"Pious souls, be faithful in honouring this august Trinity; make of your hearts a crib to which you will invite Jesus and Joseph, if you would not rather make of it a temple with three altars, or even a mount of purity on which you can raise three tabernacles, the first dedicated to Jesus, the second to Mary, and the third to Joseph; and if you desire that they should there establish their dwellings, ornament them according to the advice of the devout St. Bernard, with mortification, justice, and piety; mortification as regards yourself, using soberly the goods and pleasures of this present life; with justice towards your neighbour, rendering to every man according to his condition; and with piety towards God, acting with fervour in all that concerns his glory.

"I should consider it a very good thing, says a pious author, that the servants of Joseph should sometimes entreat him to come into their souls, and to bring with him the little Jesus with his holy mother, that he may there honour them as he did in Egypt, gently beseeching them to destroy the vain idols of self love, vanity, sensuality, and other disorderly passions which corrupt nature has there set up, to their great displeasure.

"Pious souls, pronounce often, and with confidence, these sacred names—Jesus, Mary, Joseph; names of peace and love, NAMES OF SALVATION and benediction, names of

* The three persons who compose the Holy Family are commonly called the created Trinity, although in effect it is uncreated in the person of Jesus.